UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,141	12/29/2000	Joshua L. Coates	P19172X	1810

76973 7590 06/09/2008

The Law Offices of Christopher K. Gagne
c/o Intellevate, LLC
B.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402

EXAMINER	
DAILEY, THOMAS J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/753,141	COATES ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THOMAS J. DAILEY	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *26 February 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *6/3/2008*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statements filed 6/3/2008 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.
3. The applicant has cited various Office Action Response from the Patent Office for varying cases with a common inventor. Copies of these Office Actions were not filed along with the IDS.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 12-14, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik et al. (US Pub No. 2002/0010757), hereafter "Granik," in view of Puhl et al (US Pat. No. 6,223,291), hereafter "Puhl."

7. As to claim 1, Granik discloses a method for downloading a file from a remote storage center to an end-user computer for content provided from a content server (Fig. 1 and Abstract), said method comprising the steps of:

receiving a request from an end-user computer for content at a content server ([0038], lines 1-11):

transmitting from said content server to said end-user computer, in response to said end-user request, said content comprising at least one storage resource locator ("SRL"), [the user downloads a replacement ad/image (content) from server 24 ([0038], lines 6-10) i.e. content is transmitted to the user. The ad/image (content) includes accompany data such as URL (col. 5, [0040], lines 6-9), the URL is storage resource locator because it is a link that identifies the address the file is stored at]

transmitting a request for said file from said end-user computer to a remote storage center, including transmitting said SRL for said file ([0043], lines 1-16); and

transmitting, from said storage center to said end-user computer, the file identified by said SRL [new content replacement files are sent to the user ([0043], lines 16-19)].

Granik does not disclose the SRL additionally comprising a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content, the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field of the SRL, the being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file.

However, Puhl discloses a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with content (column 4, lines 24-26, a fingerprint uniquely identifies a software product (a file)), and a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field, the another field being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file (column 4, lines 24-36, the Product Certificate ("a field generated…") is a digitally signed (i.e. by a key (shared secret)) hash value (i.e. the fingerprint (the another field generated by a hash of the contents of the file)). Further, the Product Certificate is included with the software product).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl in order to ensure the integrity and the validity of distributed software.

8. As to claim 12, Granik discloses a system comprising:

content server for receiving a request from an end-user computer for content, and for transmitting to said end-user computer, in response to said end-user request, said content comprising at least one storage resource locator ("SRL"), [the user downloads a replacement ad/image (content) from server 24 ([0038], lines 6-10) i.e. content is transmitted to the user. The ad/image (content) includes accompany data such as URL (col. 5, [0040], lines 6-9), the URL is storage resource locator because it is a link that identifies the address the file is stored at]

storage center for receiving a request for said file from said end-user computer, including transmitting said SRL for said file ([0043], lines 1-16), and for transmitting, from said end-user computer, said file identified by said SRL [new content replacement files are sent to the user ([0043], lines 16-19)].

Granik does not disclose the SRL additionally comprising a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content, the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field of the SRL, the being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file.

However, Puhl discloses a software product including a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with content (column 4, lines 24-26, a fingerprint uniquely identifies a software product (a file)), the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field of the SRL, the another field being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file (column 4, lines 24-36, the Product Certificate ("a field generated…") is a digitally signed (i.e. by a key (shared secret)) hash value (i.e. the fingerprint (the another field generated by a hash of the contents of the file)). Further the Product Certificate is included with the software product).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl in order to ensure the integrity and the validity of distributed software.

9. As to claim 21, Granik discloses a storage center (Fig. 1, label 24) comprising:

storage for storing a plurality of files ([0038], lines 1-11);

storage control (Fig. 1, label 27) for receiving a request from and end-user computer, remote from said storage center, for at least one file, and for transmitting said file to said end-user computer, said request comprising at least one storage resource locator ("SRL") corresponding to said file [the user

downloads a replacement ad/image (content) from server 24 ([0038], lines 6-10) i.e. content is transmitted to the user. The ad/image (content) includes accompany data such as URL (col. 5, [0040], lines 6-9), the URL is storage resource locator because it is a link that identifies the address the file is stored at).

Granik does not disclose the SRL additionally comprising a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with said content, the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field of the SRL, the being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file.

However, Puhl discloses a software product including a unique file identifier generated from the contents of a file to identify the file associated with content (column 4, lines 24-26, a fingerprint uniquely identifies a software product (a file)), the SRL including a field generated based upon hashing involving both a shared secret and another field of the SRL, the another field being generated based upon a hash of the contents of the file (column 4, lines 24-36, the Product Certificate ("a field generated…") is a digitally signed (i.e. by a key (shared secret)) hash value (i.e. the fingerprint (the another field generated by a hash of the contents of the file)). Further the Product Certificate is included with the software product).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl in order to ensure the integrity and the validity of distributed software.

10. As to claims 2, 13, and 22, Granik discloses the steps of:

determining, at said storage center, using said authentication certificate, whether said request is valid ([0029]); and

transmitting, from said storage center to said end-user computer, said file only if said request is valid ([0040], lines 1-6).

11. As to claims 3, 14, and 23, Granik discloses the steps of:

transmitting to said end-user computer an SRL further comprising a time-out parameter ([0040], lines 10-16, activation and deactivation times of images reads on a “time out parameter”); and

determining whether said request is valid through said time-out parameter ([0040], lines 17-19, users accounts are deleted after a predefined amount of time of inactivity (time out parameter, thereby making any subsequent requests invalid).

12. As to claim 24, Puhl discloses the another field identifies an operation to be performed involving the file and also includes the hash of the contents of the file

(column 4, lines 24-36, as the fingerprint is a hash of the contents of the software product, its presence indicates that a hash must be performed on the software product to ensure its integrity).

13. Claims 4-8 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik as applied to claims 1 and 12 above, in view of Puhl in further view of Schleimer et al (US Pat. No. 6,108,655), hereafter "Schleimer."

14. As to claims 4 and 15, Granik discloses a replacing the original content with new content after receiving the user's request and based on user information, and includes a URL with the content for enabling user access to a destination web site providing the new content ([0043], lines 1-16).

Granik and Puhl do not explicitly disclose the SRL (i.e. the URL in Granik and Smyk) is embedded into content.

Schleimer discloses the SRL (i.e. the URL in Granik and Smyk) is embedded into content (Fig. 6A & 6B, show where content (web pages) contains embedded URL).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl with the teaching

of Schleimer in order to be able to identify the location where the content is stored and be able to retrieve it.

15. As to claims 5 and 16, Granik and Puhl do not disclose:

transmitting hyper-text mark-up language ("HTML") content; and

embedding said SRL into said content comprises embedding said SRL into said HTML.

Schleimer discloses:

transmitting hyper-text mark-up language ("HTML") content (Fig. 6A, label 84); and

embedding said SRL into said content comprises embedding said SRL into said HTML (Fig. 6A, label 90).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl with the teaching of Schleimer in order to be able to identify the location where the content is stored and be able to retrieve it.

16. As to claims 6 and 17, Schleimer discloses:

storing at least one SRL for a file in an SRL file [Fig. 6B; labels 100 and 106 are URLs (SRL) and label 94 is the URL file] and

extracting said SRL from said SRL file [Fig. 6B; item 104 is an extracted URL (SRL) from URL file].

17. As to claims 7 and 18, Schleimer discloses:

coupling a local device comprising a cache to said content server (col. 7, lines 8-10),

storing at least one SRL for at least one file in said cache of said local device (col. 7, lines 10-13), and

extracting said SRL, from said cache of said local device (col. 7, lines 37-42).

18. As to claims 8 and 19, Schleimer discloses:

mounting said local device as a storage device for said content server for access to said SRLs (col. 7, lines 8-12, as Schleimer's server cache is typically "a hard disk drive" in will be mounted and is a storage device which has access to SRLs (URLs)).

19. Claims 9 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik in view of Puhl in further view of Crow et al. (US Pat. 6,895,418), hereafter "Crow."

20. As to claims 9 and 20, Granik and Puhl do not disclose:

storing at least one SRL for at least one file in an SRL file;

storing said file for access by a file system; and

organizing said SRL files in a file system, accessible to said content server, with a file structure substantially similar to said file structure for said files.

However, Crow discloses:

storing at least one SRL for at least one file in an SRL file (Fig. 5, label 61 and column 3, lines 34-42. As disclosed by Smyk, file name constitute URLs (SRLs), and file names are arranged in directories as shown in Fig. 5, where directories read on SRL files);

storing said file for access by a file system (column 3, lines 34-42); and

organizing said SRL files in a file system, accessible to said content server, with a file structure substantially similar to said file structure for said files (column 3, lines 34-42, with the content server being where Crow's file system resides upon).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl with the teaching of Crow in order to have a plurality of SRLs more organized via a file system which also provides more flexiability for extending existing files (Crow, column 1, lines 65-67).

21. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granik in view of Puhl in further view of Shuping et al. (US Pub. 2002/0054114), hereafter “Shuping.”

Granik discloses:

the step of transmitting a request for said file from said end-user computer to a remote storage center ([0038], lines 1-11),

the step of transmitting said file from said storage center to said end-user computer ([0038], lines 6-10).

Granik and Puhl do not disclose:

transmitting the request comprising transmitting a hyper-text transfer protocol ("HTTP") request,

transmitting the file comprising transmitting the files using HTTP.

Shuping discloses:

transmitting the request comprising transmitting a hyper-text transfer protocol ("HTTP") request ([0034], lines 5-13),

transmitting the file comprising transmitting the files using HTTP ([0035]).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Granik and Puhl with the

teaching pf Shuping in order to facilitate the transmission of the request and the retrieved web pages through a network such as the Internet.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

23. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Dailey whose telephone number is 571-270-1246. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday; 9:00am - 5:00pm.

25. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

26. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. J. D./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146